



Cumbria Shared Internal Audit Service
Internal Audit report for Cumbria Constabulary
Audit Follow up of Trauma Risk Incident Management
(TRiM)

Draft Report Issued: 17th December 2020

Final Report Issued: 14th January 2021

Audit Resources

Title	Name	Email	Telephone
Audit Manager	Emma Toyne	emma.toyne@cumbria.gov.uk	07775 113487
Lead Auditor	Sarah Fitzpatrick	Sarah.fitzpatrick@cumbria.gov.uk	07464522833

Audit Report Distribution

For Action:	Superintendent Lisa Hogan (Head of People)
For Information:	Stephen Kirkpatrick (Director of Corporate Support)
Audit Committee:	The Joint Audit Committee which is due to be held on 17 th March 2021, will receive the report.

Note: Audit reports should not be circulated wider than the above distribution without the consent of the Audit Manager.

Executive Summary

Background

An audit of Trauma Risk Incident Management (TRiM) was originally reported in February 2020. The scope of the work focussed on management's arrangements for governance, risk management and internal control in the following areas:

- Governance, co-ordination and oversight of TRiM arrangements.

Based on the evidence provided at that time, the audit concluded that the controls in operation provided **Partial** assurance. Improvements were agreed in the following areas:

High priority

- Governance arrangements in respect of TRiM had not been defined, documented and communicated with clear lines of responsibility.
- Decisions taken around TRiM recruitment were based on geography and a two day training event rather than an interview and selection process and refresher training arrangements for TRiM practitioners did not meet national TRiM standards.

Medium priority

- Up to date TRiM information was not readily accessible and arrangements were not in place to maintain data quality.

Advisory issues

- Feedback was not being sought from staff who had participated in TRiM processes to inform improvement activity.

Internal Audit has undertaken a follow up audit to provide updated assurance to senior management and the Joint Audit Committee that previously agreed actions to address recommendations have been fully implemented.

Audit Approach

Follow up Methodology

The Internal Audit follow up process involved obtaining details of management updates to Joint Audit Committee and then undertaking testing as necessary to confirm that the reported actions have been fully implemented and that controls are working as intended to mitigate risk. Testing was undertaken on the high priority and medium priority issues.

It is the responsibility of management to continue to monitor the effectiveness of internal controls to ensure they continue to operate effectively.

Assurance Opinion

Each audit review is given an assurance opinion and this provides Members and Officers with an independent assessment of the overall level of control and potential impact of any identified system weaknesses. Where we undertake a full audit review there are 4 levels of assurance opinion which may be applied. The definition for each level is explained in **Appendix A**.

Where the outcome of a follow up confirms that actions have been successfully implemented and controls are working effectively, the internal audit assurance opinion may be revised from that provided for the original audit. For Follow up audits, there are only 3 levels of assurance opinion which may be applied, with 'reasonable' assurance being the highest assurance opinion achievable.

From the areas examined and tested as part of this follow up review, we now consider the current controls relating to TRiM provide **Reasonable** assurance (the highest achievable for a follow up audit). This has been revised from the original opinion of Partial assurance.

The revised audit opinion assumes that controls assessed as adequate and effective in the original report have not changed and these have not been revisited as part of the follow up.

Summary of Audit Findings and Recommendations

There are three levels of audit recommendation. The definition for each level is explained in Appendix A.

The previous audit raised **three** audit recommendations for action. All **three** recommendations have been successfully implemented.

Recommendations confirmed by Internal Audit as fully implemented:

- **Governance Arrangements:** A dedicated TRiM post, as originally intended, was not considered necessary. Instead, an Inspector level resource, seconded to the People Department as part of the Constabulary's COVID-19 response, was assigned as TRiM Co-ordinator (due to work undertaken during COVID-19 and commitment demonstrated to health and wellbeing issues). The Inspector's responsibilities included TRiM to ensure that issues highlighted in the original Internal Audit Report would be fully addressed. The TRiM responsibilities were clearly communicated to the Inspector by the Head of People and the Chief Inspector CJU & Partnerships. An action plan was developed by the Inspector, in consultation with the Head of People to ensure timely implementation of all agreed management actions arising from the Internal Audit Review. Action plan progress is reviewed and discussed during supervision on a regular basis, the majority of actions are now marked as complete.
- **Recruitment, Selection and Training:** Additional TRiM capacity was generated within the People Department to meet the requirements for more effective co-ordination, record keeping, recruitment and resourcing. The profile of TRiM has been raised in the Constabulary through a re-launch programme with webpage developments, recruitment adverts and a video release. This has provided further clarity around what skills are desirable in TRiM Assessors and any new applicants need to demonstrate the approval and support of their line managers regarding their suitability.

The Inspector has developed a rota system for TRiM enquiries to ensure a more balanced allocation of work and to help flag any capacity or training issues. Refresher and mentoring CPD training has taken place this year and further events are planned for 2021 such as a two-day selection course and further CPD training.

- **TRiM Information:** A central log of TRiM cases is now in place to record TRiM referrals, assessments undertaken (including those declined) and the outcomes of assessments in a consistent format. This allows the Inspector to maintain an oversight of the volume of referrals received, distribution and timeliness of assessments for management purposes.

The TRiM webpages on the force intranet have been moved to the wellbeing area for greater prominence, re-vamped visually and brought up to date. Photographs have been added to an updated list of TRiM Assessors which makes the service more accessible and welcoming.

Director of Corporate Support Comments

I am very pleased to note that this follow up review has recognised the progress made since the Trauma Risk Incident Management (TRiM) audit (reported February 2020) and has moved the assurance rating from partial to reasonable which is the highest level of assurance awarded for follow up work.

The initial audit positively reported that there were many strengths with the service provided, noting that it was a discretionary rather than mandatory service provided by voluntary practitioners on top of their normal responsibilities. That said, the initial audit also identified a number of areas for improvement.

The Constabulary recognises that the provision of the TRiM service is a very important aspect of wellbeing support provided following traumatic events and has therefore worked hard to address the areas identified in the initial report.

As noted in the follow up report, the Constabulary have strengthened governance arrangements, including the secondment of an Inspector to the People Department with clear responsibilities including TRiM activities. The Inspector developed an action plan to address the recommendations and I am pleased to note that, as detailed within the report, regular review and strong progress is being made with the majority of actions now being complete.

The profile, skills and capacity to support and undertake the TRiM processes have also been increased across the organisation. Whilst remaining a voluntary service, a rota system for TRiM enquiries has now helped balance the allocation of work and is helping to flag any capacity or training issues. I am pleased to note that a central log of TRiM enquiries is now maintained to help better manage and develop the service further.

In summary, I am very pleased that this follow up report shows the excellent efforts of all involved to further develop and enhance the whole approach to Wellbeing of which TRiM is a key component.

Stephen Kirkpatrick

14/01/2021

Audit Assurance Opinions

There are four levels of assurance used, these are defined as follows:

Assurance Level	Definition
Substantial (Not available for follow ups)	Sound frameworks of governance, risk management and internal control are in place and are operating effectively. Recommendations, if any, will typically be no greater than advisory.
Reasonable	Frameworks of governance, risk management and internal control are generally sound with some opportunities to further develop the frameworks or compliance with them. Recommendations will typically be no greater than medium priority.
Partial	Weaknesses in the frameworks of governance, risk management and/or internal control have been identified or there are areas of non-compliance with the established control framework which place the achievement of system / service objectives at risk. Recommendations will typically include high and medium priority issues.
Limited	There are significant gaps in the governance, risk management and/or internal control frameworks or there are major lapses in compliance with the control framework that place the achievement of system / service objectives at significant risk. Recommendations will include high priority issues.

Grading of Audit Recommendations

Audit recommendations are graded in terms of their priority and risk exposure if the issue identified was to remain unaddressed. There are three levels of audit recommendations used; high, medium and advisory, the definitions of which are explained below:

Grading	Definition
High	A recommendation to address a significant gap in governance, risk management or internal control frameworks or to address significant non-compliance with controls in place.
Medium	A recommendation to address a gap in governance, risk management or internal control frameworks or to address aspects of non-compliance with controls in place.
Advisory	A recommendation to further strengthen governance, risk management or internal control frameworks or to improve compliance with existing controls.

This page has been intentionally left blank